

54L403

Date: 02/13/01
Page: 1

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM
IDENTIFICATION FORM

AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : CIA
RECORD NUMBER : 104-10534-10200
RECORD SERIES : JFK
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : NOSENKO RECORDS

Released under the John F.
Kennedy Assassination Records
Collection Act of 1992 (44 USC
2107 Note). Case#:NW 53216
Date: 06-14-2017

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR : CIA
FROM :
TO :
TITLE : UNTITLED MEMORANDUM: IN PREFACE IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT
THE FOLLOWING ANALYSIS
DATE : 01/14/64
PAGES : 35
SUBJECTS : NOSENKO
NBR

DOCUMENT TYPE : PAPER, TEXTUAL DOCUMENT
CLASSIFICATION : UNCLASSIFIED
RESTRICTIONS :
CURRENT STATUS : POSTPONED IN FULL
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 02/09/01
OPENING CRITERIA :
COMMENTS : JFK-M-24:F55 2001.02.09.14:58:49:083084: NOT BELIEVED
RELEVANT (NBR). BARELY LEGIBLE IN PLACES. INCLUDED IN
104-10211-10002.

[R] - ITEM IS RESTRICTED

GB

#6

14 January, 1964

In preface it should be noted that the following analysis is necessarily incomplete, as the undersigned did not have access to the original documents; nor has it been possible to debrief Mrs. OSWALD regarding some of the Soviet documents and other material contained in the FBI provided material. However, despite these shortcomings, the following analysis is offered in the hope that it may serve as a guide for future debriefing of Mrs. OSWALD. It is my firm belief that such further debriefing of Mrs. OSWALD is necessary because of numerous mistakes in her Soviet documentation; suspicious gaps and discrepancies in her history regarding her life in the USSR; and some peculiarities in her correspondence with addressees in the USSR, which strongly suggest that some form of open code was employed between her and her correspondents in the USSR.

4. Prior to my analysis of Mrs. [REDACTED]'s Soviet documentation we should be asked how she received the patronymic Nikolayevna. Her biographic data indicates she was born out of wedlock. This is confirmed by her birth certificate, in which the name of the father is not listed. This is military Soviet practice for registration of bastard children. If she took the patronymic of her step-father, her patronymic should be Aleksandrovna, after her stepfather's given name. In the Soviet police state, birth registration records are meticulously maintained.

Especially ^{with} regard to the paternity of newborn children, ^{because} as this is a life-long indicator of the father of the child. As is well known the derivation, profession, politics, etc., of the father frequently governs the future security clearances of Soviet citizens, their qualification to enter the CPSU, higher education, teaching, government service etc.

From my own experience in the Soviet security services I

know that the Soviets will not register the name of the father if there has not been a formal marriage - even if the identity of the common-law father is known.

3. Birth Certificates - Actually three copies of Marina's birth certificates are furnished. ITEM #340 is a copy of her birth certificate issued on 19 July 1961, in Arkhangelsk.^{copy} The other two birth certificates are contained in ITEMS 264-270. These are notarized copies of ITEM #340, notarized in MINSK. One of those later two birth certificates was procured on 4 Aug. 1961 and the required second was obtained on 8 Aug. 1961. Two different notary's notarized these two birth certificates - both obtained in Minsk within a four day period. By the handwriting it is obvious that the same person filled out the MINSK birth certificates - only the notary's^s signatures

are different. Regarding all three birth certificates
the following questions should be asked of Marina:

What is

- a) The origin of her NIKOLAYEVNA patronymic.
- b) What happened to the original of her birth certificate which she must have had in order to enter primary school, pharmacy school, and to get her passport when she reached the age of 16 - in 1957? ² In Minsk a person is entitled, and
- c) Why did she request a second copy, marked "POVTORNAYA", of her birth certificate ITEM #340 from ARKHANGELSKY ² about
- d) ITEM #340 was issued in Arkhangelsk about a 1000 kilometers from MINSK. Did she travel there personally to apply for her birth certificate? Did she write for it? Was it sent to her through the mail or did she pick it up at the Minsk militia headquarters? ²

What reason did she give the ARKHANGELSK militia

authorities for requesting the second copy of her birth certificate. Why was she applying for this birth certificate on 19 July 1961.

e) The ITEM #340 birth certificate is supposed to be an exact duplicate of the birth certificate issued after her birth. This normally is issued several days after birth because parents do not usually rush down to register the birth of a child on the day of the birth - not even in the USSR. ITEM #340 shows that MARINA's birth was registered on 14 Aug. 1941 and that she was born on 17 July 1941. Marina applied for a copy of this certificate on 19 July 1961. For some reason the 9 in 19 July 1961, is marked over and is an obvious change of the figure 4 to a 9 in the following way (1). An examination of the original will better show if this was a marked over deliberate change. Such a change could only be signifi-

cant if it is not a bona-fide document; actually issued in ARKHANGELSK. Personal document conscious Soviets would note such an obvious change. Certainly if she applied for the two notarized copies of her birth certificate using ITEM #340 as a basis for these new copies she would be closely questioned and it is more than likely that notarized copies would not be issued on a marked over original. Now it might be possible that the first notary would not have noticed the marked over original. However, a second notarized birth certificate was issued in Minsk by still another notary.

4. Vaccination Certificate. (Included in ITEMS 262-279)

In connection with discussion of Marina OSWALD's date of birth, it is worthwhile to note that this date is given as "17/7/62" on her vaccination certificate. This indicates that 17 July is the date she intended to use as a birthdate. The "common and natural error" of using the current year -- 1960 -- in the date, however, does nothing to dispel the confusion of the year of her birth.

- (a) Mrs. OSWALD might be asked about the procedure followed in accomplishing the vaccinations and in obtaining the certificates. It appears that at least four persons were involved in the completion of such certificate. (Marina signed her name to the certificate, one named for June, another person printed in the names and dates of birth (possibly Lee also filled in these blanks

for June, but it was neither Lee nor Marina who completed this portion of Marina's certificate);

3- the vaccinator ("ship's physician") dated and certified the vaccinations; and

4- apparently still another person (possibly an assistant to the physician) printed in the vaccinator's position and the type of vaccination given.

b) Mrs. OSWALD certainly should be asked how she and Jane received vaccinations from the ship's physician and certificates signed by the physician and bearing a Dutch certification stamp on 15 and 16 May 1962, although they did not leave Moscow until 1 June. (Or which date the OSWALD's signed a

provisionary note for the transportation train). ^{A partial explanation for the entries in}
^{the certificate}
^{can be found in the explanation}
^{printed below. It would be interesting to know the reason}
^{for the discrepancy).}

that Marina and her daughter were vaccinated on different days.

(STERE 161-270). Examination of this document also raises some question concerning both biographic information supplied and that found neither in Marina's autobiography nor in the reports on interviews with her.

a) Marina -- already 18, according to her given date of birth, and with a pharmacist's training -- arrived in Minsk at the end of August 1950. Why was she not issued a voyenny billet until 22 September? Further, why was no registration stamp placed in the booklet until 28 October?

b) According to Lee OSMOND's diary, Marina was a Komsomol member. The military service booklet, however, shows that she was neither a Komsomol or CPSU member. What proper explanation can Marina offer for this?

c) In Section XII, "Special notes. (Osobyye Otmetki)" of this document, it is shown that Marina was given

notice to be ready for the military call-up; the document also shows, however that on 4 August this notice was cancelled. One logical explanation for this might be that the cancellation was made when Marina informed the commissariat of her marriage. But Mrs. OSNAID should be asked about this, and her answer should be noted carefully.

d) Section X of this document shows that as noted above, Marina was registered in Minsk in Frunzenskiy Rayon on 28 October 1969, whence she was registered on 4 August 1961; on 9 August she was registered in Leninsky Rayon. Nowhere in Marina's autobiography, the report on the FBI's interviews of Marina or any other official papers belonging to the OSNAIDS, is there any mention of the change of residence which allowed/required this change in registration. There is some discussion of the change

in Lee OSWALD's correspondence, with an indication

that their apartment in Frunzensky Rayon was re-

occupied almost as soon as the OSWALD's left.

Mrs. Oswald must be asked about this move in detail.

Why did they move? What were the exact addresses?

Who were their neighbors? And so on. This move

is all the more interesting, not because it was

given so little attention in Mrs. Oswald's testi-

mony (it seems she has offered little detailed

coverage of any part of her life), but because

it took place in the middle of the period in

which the OSWALD's were arranging to return to the

U.S. According to Lee's diary for the period,

15 July to 20 August, the OSWALD's found that they

were required to have around twenty documents in

order to apply for an exit visa; they submitted

these documents on 20 August and learned that they

would have a three-and-a-half month wait before knowing whether or not they could leave the Soviet Union. Why did the DSWAID's make the move when they were planning to leave the USSR, according to the zone of secret letters, as soon as possible - without, and especially through manipulation, of this leave and critical period is an absolute necessity.

6. Work Booklet. (PTB# p346). It must be noted here that the copy of this document as supplied is incomplete; unless the remainder of this document has been withheld, it is necessary to know why Marica had only this portion of her Work Booklet.

a) Another change in Marica's life which occurred within the 15 July - 10 August 1961 period is

indicated in this document by an order, dated

16 July 1961, Marica was transferred, apparently

promised, to the duties of assistant druggist at
the hospital where she had been working since 1959.

An investigation of the reasons for this change,
particularly in light of other changes noted, is in
order.

b. It seems from the copy supplied that all entries
on pages 2 and 3 were made not only by the same person,
but - from the "flow" of the script - also at the same
time. An examination of the original is required to de-
termine if this is so.

7. Trade Union Pocklet. (Profsoyuznyy bilet; included in
ITEMS 491-276) There are a number of irregularities --

indicated in questions below -- in Marina's Profsoyuznyy
bilet, for which, ~~possibly~~, logical explanations might be

found. They do not occur singly, however, and in

view of the occurrence of similar and apparently related
irregularities in her other documents at the same time, an

Marina's trade union dues payments.

a) According to her trade union booklet, Marina (Marina VIKTOROVNA DEDKINA) became a member of the Trade Union of Medical Workers in 1953 (exact date not given). This same booklet, however, records her trade union dues payments beginning only in June 1959; further it shows that in 1959, she made only two payments (one, of 1 ruble; the second, of 50 kopecks). After July 1959, no payments are recorded until January 1960, in which year she made monthly payments until August. No later payments are shown. Aside from the question of irregularity of payments, we must ask how it was possible for Marina to have passed through the first 1959 period without paying dues at all. It is not possible and, and therefore, Marina must have had at least one other trade union booklet during those three years. It is reported that Marina was issued her first

1) Tsvetanov's passport (dated January 1962) shows him to be born in Leningrad (1933-1950). It is evident that Tsvetanov is a graduate of the Leningrad Law Institute, and it is now known that she followed in his footsteps.

2) The booklet shows that Tsvetanov was registered at the Leningrad Law Institute School on 25 November (no record found) and was deregistered on 16 June (again, no record shown). It is believed that Tsvetanov has transferred through the school near or upon the day of her graduation. No subsequent registration is noted. Why are the years in which these official acts took place not recorded? Why is her registration in Leningrad not shown? It is obvious that she must have been registered there, having paid dues in 1958 and 1959.

3) Tsvetanov's identification booklet gives documentary proof for the very last question of her date of birth, indicated in paragraph 3, "Birth certificates", of the document - an above questionable certificate and, therefore, an invalid birth date either is not given or fails to be given. In this document the year of birth is recorded as 1936. It is possible that an error in spelling or an error of a

feudal's might be made by an official issuing such a booklet, but it is impossible to believe that either Marina or the official routinely would err in recording her year of birth. It is probable that someone other than Marina filled in the information required for this document; then, either the issuing official or Marina deliberately lied in this instance. Why? Where, when and by whom was the basic information recorded?

S. Passport. (Vid na zhatel'stvo; ITEM #348).

Without the original of the document and supporting papers at hand, it is difficult to find documentary grounds for a number of questions which might be asked of Mrs. OSWALD. In any case, however, her answers to the following inquiries concerning her passport will be of greatest importance and usefulness.

a) Why was Mrs. OSWALD given a passport made valid from 11 January 1961 to 11 January 1964? It might be said, of course, that it was expected that she would no longer need the passport after the latter date because she was the wife of a U.S. citizen returning to the U.S. to stay.

According to her visa on page 17, on 24 May 1962 she was granted non-quota (B-1) status for entry into the U.S. Then, why was the passport made

valid for 2 years, when she was expected -- according to her exit visa (see page 15 in the passport) -- to depart the USSR on or before 1 December 1967. Did she expect to return to visit her relatives? Within two years? On the ^{as} yet undetermined salary of a man unable to purchase a passage to the U.S. on the basis of his own resources? See also paragraph 9 a. below.

- b) Why was Jane's name entered into both Marina's and Lee's passport, instead of just into Lee's?
- c) Although the OSWALD's were given official permission to leave (see exit visa) only on 11 January 1968, Lee's diary notes that they knew of this on 5 January. How were they informed?
- d) Marina's permit was made valid until 1 December 1967, but the diary notes that they had only 6 months in which to leave. Why? Although some explanations for this can be found, it seems best to question Mrs. OSWALD and let her give the explanations.

9. Various Certificates. (ITEM #245).

- a) Certificate of "Information on Persons Doing Abroad (privately or by organization or group)." The entries on the copy of this document as provided for her are completely illegible. In spots con-

ained information which could bear significantly on questions raised concerning Mrs. OSWALD's passport and exit visa; this is particularly true of that portion bearing her statement of destination and proposed length of stay. It would be most interesting also to know what is written beneath the words, "private exit (chastayy vyyed)", in her statement on the purpose of her travel. Why was no departure date (data vystrelja) entered on this certificate? Why in the entry, "None (not in active)", given in the space for names and birthdates (years) of members of her family going abroad? Why did the person completing that portion of Marina's certificate requiring the date upon which her passport was submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the number and date of the cover letter fail to fill in the above-mentioned information, after apparently starting to provide it?

b) Certificate of vaccination for June, issued by the Minsk First City Children's Hospital, May 18, 1962. This date does not correspond exactly to the date of vaccination (15 May) given in Jane OSWALD's International Certificate of Vaccination or Revaccination against Smallpox. In

copy, the vaccination information from the hospital certificate into the official certificate required, it is most unlikely that such an error could be made under normal circumstances, particularly in view of the clarity with which "16 May" is written on the hospital certificate. See paragraph 11 a) below.

c) High school identification card for Lee OSWALD, dated 4 September 1958. There is nothing unusual about this card as shown in the copy given, except that it was among Marina's papers and that it, among all other types of papers possibly, was saved and carried about by Lee CSTRaid and among the OSWALD possessions from 4 September 1958 until the time of its seizure. Mr. OSWALD should be questioned in connection with this also.

10. Pharmacy school diploma (included in Items 10a-11a).

All information required in completing Marina's pharmacy school diploma has been entered therein, with the exception of the year of her entry into the school. In view of the care taken by the responsible official to see that each "n" (only, postscriptum, deceased) was entered to the appropriate space, this year can only be considered deliberate.

11. Two documents (included in Items 271-280). The first of these (see 11 a)) is of greater importance to our

examination at the moment, bearing as it does on the discussion of irregularities in the OSWALD shot records.

The importance of the second is yet to be proven.

a) Certificate of revaccination (for Marina), issued by the Minsk (exact designation unclear in copy) Polyclinic No. 3, 18 May 1962. Again, (see paragraph 5 b) above), the date does not correspond exactly to the date of vaccination (16 May) given in Marina's International Certificate. Here also it is unlikely that an official certifying a vaccination given by someone else at an earlier date would have mistaken the date as given on the original certificate. Then if the certifying ship's physician merely accepted the OSWALD's word for the date of the vaccinations, why did he not so indicate in the International Certificates? How did it happen that he also accepted their word for Marina's revaccination, on a second (16 May) date? Why was he given a second date? Surely even if the OSWALD's had been unable to remember the exact date, they would have remembered that the vaccinations were accomplished on the same day. Then, why did Marina not return to her former place of employment (the Combined Third Clinical Hospital) for the vaccinations? Remembering that, according to the

original certificates, Marina and June actually were vaccinated on the same day, and that June was yet a baby, it is possible to believe that Marina had to take June to the children's hospital and then went to Polyclinic No. 12 because it was closer to that hospital. It is also possible that Marina was instructed to have the vaccinations done only at these places. But by whom and under what circumstances were these instructions issued? The other similar and seemingly related irregularities in Marina's documents mentioned above require that the answers to the questions posed and others indicated be clarified in the greatest detail.

b) Payroll voucher. Marina should be asked when and in what manner this item came into her possession and who entered the name -- OSVALD (OSVALDO) -- upon it, by its appearance -- i.e., by the entry of her married name -- and in accordance with its purpose, unless it belonged to Lee, unlikely in view of his monthly salary, it should have been prepared some time between 30 April 1961 and 20 March 1962. In what condition is the original document? Why was this document and no other kept? Why was the bottom portion of the voucher not completed? It is not unusual that the two official signatures of the document are identical; but, according with issuance, this

Now, to become an official document with official purpose, it is required that the controller of the information required be provided in the spaces indicated. This includes the full name. Therefore, because blank voucher forms are not readily available to the general public, Lee's and Marland's access to the issuing organization's accounting offices and all other respects of her receipt of this voucher must be fully explained. Also, the figures and their arrangement on the form must be included among items to be subjected to typewritten analysis.

III. Martindale's life in the USSR (Autobiography, included in ITW's 127-150; FBI Interview Record).

Let us proceed from this brief discussion of Mrs. OSWAID's documents, their irregularities and the questions posed, to an examination of her autobiography, the biographic information she provided -- and failed to provide -- in her interviews with the FBI and the apparent attitude with which they were provided. It must be noted in the very beginning that in many ways, aside from revealing still more irregularities, these also still corroborate and were frustrating questions -- greater because they more strongly indicate falsification and warrant suspicion of their bearer, and more frustrating because it is still more difficult to prove this falsification and basis for suspicion.

a) In Marina's autobiography twice given the year of her mother's death as 1957. Yet, it must be noted that in both cases, Marina first has written "1956", then has re-written the date to read "1957". When did her mother die? Is it reasonable that after so few years, and for such a critical point in her life, Marina would again make an error of a year (prior error in Marina's own year of birth)?

b. Passing over questions regarding Marina's father, the year of her birth and that on which she entered pharmacy school -- which were discussed in connection with her documents, we must look at Marina's list of relatives in the USSR. If this autobiography was prepared for the purpose of getting a visa to the US -- it was written in the USSR (see note on husband's place of work), was it necessary to list uncles and aunts? If so, why did she mention only the BERLOV's of Minsk and omit mention of the PRUSAKOV's, also of Minsk. Comparatively little contact between Marina and the BERLOV's while in the USSR, and none (no correspondence) since in the US., is on record; while she did live with the PRUSAKOV's an ample and uninterrupted contact with them by mail after she came to the US. (in the course of her interview with the FBI, Marina apparently made no mention

of the BERLOV's). Who are the BERLOV's, really? By coincidence it seems, her aunt -- Mariya Vasil'yevna BEYKOVA -- was working in the Sanitation-Epidemiological Detachment (SEO) in Minsk. In what form were Marina's relations with the BERLOV's? What contacts did Lee OSWALD have with the BERLOV's during the "engagement" and after the marriage? Did the BERLOV's object to Marina's marriage? To Lee? To an American? When and why did the apparent break in relations take place?

6. What occasioned the preparation of this autobiography? Was it, as suggested above, to accompany an application for a visa? Was it to accompany a request for an exit permit? In any case, Marina -- a citizen of the USSR since birth, fully aware and thoroughly practiced in the realities of Soviet life -- certainly should know very well that such an autobiography as that she has offered would never be accepted even as a "fictitious autobiography", as final by Soviet authorities. It is reasonable to assume also that,

as a bona fide man-on-the-street Soviet, despite any attempts from Lee or from embassy officials, she would think this true of U.S. authorities, too. There then, are all the basic details of her life - names, dates, places. One is hard pressed to find this spotty presentation other than deliberate. Do just why? That is alone telltale and why.

Marina's life before living with Marinka. The ten pages of reportage from Lutsk to Minsk (Interviewer: Mr. OSMAID) provide a summary source of facts for most of the questions posed in the foregoing paragraphs and raise many more.

(1) When Marinka's mother married Aleksander Ivanovich MEDVDEV why did he not adopt Marinka officially and legally? According to the material at hand, Marinka was just a very young child when her mother married MEDVDEV. Why did Marinka continue to live with her grandparents for such a long time after the marriage?

(2) Why, after living so long with her grandmother did she then return to live with her mother and step-father? Upon whose decision did she make the change?

(3) When and why -- before Marinka went to live with them -- did her mother and stepfather move from Arkhangelsk to the Fieldavian SSSR? What was the stepfather doing there?

(4) What occasioned the family's move to Leningrad? Was Marinka's stepfather transferred? Or did he change organizations? If he was transferred to Leningrad as a move within the same organization he must have had a very good position and reputation. Also, according to the interview record, the stepfather was a skilled telegraph operator. Yet, judging by letters (postcards) which Marinka received from her family -- if the stepfather signed these he is nearly illiterate.

(6) Note the corrections (two) in the autobiography made in regard to the year of Marina's mother's death possibly to coincide with her statement that her mother died during her second year in the Pharmacy Tekhnikum.

(6) Marina has stated that she worked in a central drug store on Nevskiy Prospekt during her last year in school. Under what circumstances did she go to work there? What were her duties? How (and how much) was she paid for this work? What other details (names of supervisors, fellow workers; hours of work, etc) can she provide about this job? How was this job terminated?

(7) What type (official designation) of pension did Marina and the other children receive? To whom (to the children directly, or to the stepfather) did the pension fall? How was it received? What was the amount of the pension?

(8) Marina said she took her meals away from home. Where? How was she able to do this? What was her total income?

(9) What did Marina dislike so much about her first job after graduation that made her quit after one day? It is one thing - "not common, but not unheard of -- not to appear for work at the place to

which a graduate may be assigned; but it is another thing to go to work and then quit after one day.

Whether or not there exists a right to a 3-day trial period such as Marina mentioned, it is almost impossible for her to have quit and gone on vacation so easily. First, she would have been in trouble immediately with the Komsomol and her trade union.

Second she has said that she spent little time in her stepfather's home, taking her meals outside, because of strained relations. Yet, there she stayed, apparently with no income - no pay and no more pensions, either from school or government. Then, how was she able to do this?

(10) Why did Marina go to work in Minsk? She has said that she lived with an aunt and uncle PRUSAKOV - her mother's brother and his wife. Marina has said nothing more in these interviews about the BERLOV's, whom she above mentioned in her autobiography (see paragraph 13 a (2) above). Marina should be asked about Lee's connections with both the PRUSAKOV's and the BERLOV's; particularly with the latter; Lee has mentioned other relatives in his diary and address book, but never the BERLOV's (in this case, the question should be addressed in just that way -- what was Lee's connection with the BERLOV's?)

(11) Marina's reasons for refusing to identify various figures from her past -- former boyfriends, acquaintances and even the woman who was her supervisor in the pharmaceutical warehouse - and for giving such vague answers to some questions regarding her background and her life with Lee must be ascertained. Her attitude and conduct in these interviews obviously is other than that which can properly be expected of the person she represents herself to be. Her testimony regarding her social life in Leningrad and Minsk prior to marriage is most suspicious. Her statements regarding the attitude of her aunt and uncle -- an MVD colonel or lieutenant colonel -- to Lee and to her marriage to an American, taken as part of her story of being "just a plain ordinary girl in love", are just unbelievable. Another example of this strange combination of refusal to give names and outright departure from the realities of Soviet life is to be found in Marina's story of her first meetings with Lee OSWAID...she refuses to name mutual acquaintances present at those meetings and tell of returning to her along with this American to whom she gave her phone number, the phone number of an MVD officer! And this MVD officer poses no objections to her later meetings, even marriage, with the American.

(12) Marina's explanation of the reason for calling her "Alik" is quite unconvincing. Had their acquaintances really experienced some difficulty with the name, Lee, the obvious next choice would have been "Lev", or even "Aleksey", in preference to "Alik". She should be questioned further about this.

(13) Other subjects which Marina obviously must know more than she has told include the reason for Lee's employment in Minsk, rather than Moscow, and the reason for the difference between Lee's high pay for his unskilled labor and her low salary. With regard to the latter, even if the only reason was just as Lee himself presented it - he received a subsidy grant through the Red Cross -- with no other considerations to be made, certainly Marina would have known of this, and, unless there were something sensitive about the subject, should not be reluctant to discuss it. Yet, her testimony would indicate she knows little or nothing of these things. Why?

(14) Why does it seem she also knows so little of her husband's nature? "Marina remarked that...he did not...discuss politics with her or, to her knowledge with any other associates. (See page 10.)" It is not remarkable that an ordinary man-on-the-street American would not discuss politics to a noticeable extent. But

how many US Marines read The Daily Worker, express pro-Soviet and pro-Communist views, defend Fidel Castro, study the Russian language and prepare to renounce their citizenship and go to the USSR? How many return to the US to proclaim their Marxist views and hand out pro-Castro pamphlets on street corners? And to assassinate the President of the US? And how may such men, usually most outstanding for their vociferation, are able to keep noticeably silent on political subjects even before their wives, while spending two or three years in their "political homeland"? Marina must be questioned closely about these things, just as she must be questioned closely in order to identify these "other associates" with whom Lee OSWALD did not discuss politics.

(15) Mrs. OSWALD must be asked about her trip to KHAR'KOV of which we would know nothing were it not for the small collection of letters written to her during her stay there. Why did she make no mention of this trip, yet talk freely of her vacation trips to Leningrad, etc? What was the purpose of the trip? What other details, (length, place of residence, etc.) can she offer about it?

13. In brief, as indicated in the foregoing, it is the

belief of the undersigned, based on the materials made

31

available, that Marina ONSAYD must be re-examined, thoroughly and at considerable length, by able experts and means available in order to clarify her story and her role in the actions of her husband following their return to the US.



GB-1

D R A F T

17 January 1964

ATTACHMENT A

To Memorandum, submitted 14 January 1964, on the biography and documents of OSWALD, Marina Nikolayevna (nee PRUSAKOVA).

1. The following is presented as an expansion upon comments and questions presented in the original memorandum (see above) and in response to specific requests from Agency personnel.

2. As noted and commented upon briefly in the original memo (see para 1), there are "suspicious gaps and discrepancies in her (Marina's) story regarding her life in the USSR." Not the least of these are connected with her/travels account of in the Soviet Union (see 12.a./ 3.b.(2)-(4), (10) and (15)); special attention should be given Marina's trips to Khar'kov and to Moscow to join her husband (the latter not covered in the original memo).

a. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ "e would know nothing of Marina's trip to Khar'kov ~~in January, 1963 (Ref. D, f. 1, p. 11)~~ and were it not for the small collection of letters written to her during her stay there. Although ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ she has spoken in some detail of other trips -- vacation trips/ -- to Leningrad, to Minsk (from Leningrad), she has not even mentioned this trip. Both the reason for this and the details of the trip itself must be examined. ~~XXXX~~ When, why and how did she go? With whom did she travel? How lengthy were her preparations for the trip (days? weeks?)? Who knew of her travel plans? Did Lee see her off on the trip? How long did she stay in Khar'kov; when ~~XXXX~~, how and with whom did she return? Who met her upon her return? Who knew of her plans to return? It appears that she stayed with the MIKHAYLOV family in Khar'kov. Did they expect her? How much time did she spend with them while in Khar'kov? What did the MIKHAYLOVs say about her marriage to an American?

(1) Although not of special importance of itself alone, a letter

D R A F T

from Lee (dated 2 October 1961) which she received while in Khar'kov indicates that she was worrying about losing her husband: "I don't ~~MMMM~~ like that you are saying that you feel that you are losing me. You never will lose me. That's that!" Marina should be asked about her relations with her husband during that period; was this the influence behind her trip to Khar'kov? Was the decision to make the trip hers alone? Or did she discuss it in advance of the decision? In short, we must investigate the details of this trip as thoroughly as possible.

b. No less attention, but from a different angle, should be given her trip to Moscow, ~~DDDDDD~~ 9-14 July 1961, to join her husband. As noted in Lee OSWALD's diary for that period, he had gone to Moscow "(without police permission)" to inquire about the return of his US passport and to "make arrangements for my wife to enter the U. S. with me." On 9 July he called Marina to join him in Moscow; on 14 July they returned to Minsk together. On 15 July, according to the diary, "Marina at work, is shocked to find out they everyone knows she entered the U. S. embassy...." Did Marina also go to Moscow without police permission? Did she not know that the US embassy is undersurveillance? ~~MMMM~~ We must ask, what ~~MMMM~~ Soviet citizen does not know that clearance with the police is required for such travel? What Soviet citizen is not aware of the Soviet government's attitude ~~mmmm~~ and conduct toward foreigners in general and Americans in particular? The diary continues: "The (blank) hold a meeting and give her a strong browbeating. The First of many indoctrinations." And how did this half-wise, half-naive American know at the time that this would be "the first of many indoctrinations?" What did the OSWALDs do in Moscow when not at the embassy? Whom did they see? Where did they go? Can Marina account for the whole of the time spent there?

Her ability to account for all of her time and activities satisfactorily
with regard to both trips -- to Khar'kov and to Moscow -- is
seriously questioned by the undersigned.

3. Serious questions also attach to her refusal to name certain figures from her past, as commented upon in the original memorandum; she not only has not named former boyfriends (which refusal, taken alone, might be understood or explained satisfactorily), but has refused to identify one of her work supervisors. What explanation can Marina offer for this? What further explanations can she give for her failure to name one set of relatives in one account of her life and another set in a second account? We must proceed from these questions to ask her to provide/details of her relationships in connection with the many persons identified, many by first name alone, in the OSWALD correspondence. Full biographic and other identifying information on all of her relatives must be requested. As much of the same type of information as is normally possible must be requested for: DZHUGANYAN, I. Ya.; Inessa; Erik? Ernst?) LARIONOVA, L. N.; TITOVENTS (what is his real last name -- TITOV, TITOVENTS?). Erik *; KHONTULEVA, Galina Petrovna*; GOLOVACHOV, Pavel*; DMOVSKAYA, Ol'ga Petrovna; Inna; Pavlik (Ltr-ITEM 137); the ZIGERS; author of ltr-item 138; Rita; GEL'FAND; ZHLCBO; Petrovna (item 140); SMOL. TOMA (both in item 140 also) or Tol'ya; SHISHKOVA, Zhanna (153) and Lilya; SHASHKOVA, Dzhanna*; Andrey (#143); Olya, Kolya and Yulya (# 148), Dzhummi; Lyuba, Nella (151); SOBOLEVA, E. I. ; Hinulya, Nadya, ZAITSEVA, Tolya, Misha, Slavik, Zhenya and BOLTENKO, Anya (all in 155); KLIMASHEVSKAYA, Lyudmila (Lyudka); RINGOLD; Tanya and Vera; Eleonorya and Anita; Aleksandr (ZIGER?); Aunt Anya; the ZIGERS*; and Lilya; the ANDRIYANOVs*; the MEDVED'YEVs*;/TARUSINA*. All of these persons were either authors of letters to the OSWALDs or were mentioned in those letters (those whose names are marked with an asterisk must receive special attention).

D R A F T

the same information ~~from which~~ must be requested for
In addition, ~~about whom~~ all persons whose names are mentioned in Lee's diary and
address books.

4. In many instances, the correspondence itself -- in which these names
are mentioned -- reveals cause for suspicion, as noted in the original memo
(see para 1), and thereby casts still further suspicion on the bearer of those
names. As noted, this correspondence includes some letters "which strongly
^(Marina)
suggest that some form of open code was employed between her and her
correspondents in the USSR." Following are some examples:

a.